

Appl. No. 10/749,045  
Amdt. Dated October 8, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2007

### **REMARKS**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed July 9, 2007.

Applicant has amended the specification to more appropriately express the subject matter thereof. The amendments to the specification are supported by, e.g., Paragraph [0030] and FIG. 4 of the original specification. No new matter is added.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 20 to more explicitly and correctly express the present invention. The amendments to claims 1, 10, and 20 are supported by, e.g., Paragraphs [0018] and [0030]; and FIGS. 1 and 4 of the original specification. Applicant has canceled claim 5, 12, and 13, without prejudice. Applicant has added a new claims 21, which is supported by, e.g., Paragraph [0018]; and FIGS. 1, 4 of the original specification. No new matter is added.

#### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112***

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In response to the rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10. Current claims 1 and 10 recite "double-wedge" instead of "papilionaceous". "The cavity having a double-wedge shape in cross-section" of amended claims 1 and 10 is clearly described in the Paragraph [0030], as amended, and shown in FIG. 4, as originally filed. It is submitted that amended claims 1 and 10 comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 10 are respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 12, and 13 have been canceled, without prejudice, and,

Appl. No. 10/749,045  
Amdt. Dated October 8, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2007

therefore, the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, and 14-19 depend from amended claims 1 and 10, which now comply with the written description for reasons as set forth. Thus, Applicant submits that such claims also comply with the written description under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant also has amended claim 20 to more appropriately express the claimed invention, in a manner supported by the specification, as originally filed. Applicant submits current claim 20 complies with the written description under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 20 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject which applicant regards as the invention.

In response to the rejections, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10. Current claim 1 recites "injecting" instead of "rejecting" and "double-wedge" instead of "papilionaceous". Current claim 10 recites "double-wedge" instead of "papilionaceous". Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 10 are clear and definite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 5, 12, and 13 have been canceled, without prejudice, and, therefore, the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, and 14-19 depend from amended claims 1 and 10, which are clear and definite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Thus, Applicant submits that such claims also are clear and definite under 35

Appl. No. 10/749,045  
Amdt. Dated October 8, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2007

U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant also has amended claim 20 to more appropriately express the claimed invention. Applicant submits that current claim 20, as amended, is clear and definite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 20 are respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102***

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuda et al (US 4, 442, 061).

In response to the rejection of claim 10, Applicant has amended claim 10 and hereby otherwise traverses this rejection. As such, Applicant submits that amended claim 10 is novel, unobvious, and patentable over Matsuda et al and the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Claim 10, as currently amended, recites in part:

“a mold for producing a light guide plate, comprising:

a **single** first plate having a side wall;

a **single** second plate..., the second plate defining a sprue therein;

a cavity for molding a light guide plate defined between the first plate and the second plate, the cavity being in communication with the sprue ...” (Emphasis added.)

Applicant submits that such a mold as set forth in claim 10, is not taught, suggested, or disclosed by Matsuda et al or any other cited references, taken

Appl. No. 10/749,045  
Amdt. Dated October 8, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2007

alone or in combination at least for the following reasons:

Matsuda et al presents a mold wherein four plates (i.e., the templates 1, 2 and cavity blocks 3, 7) cooperatively form a cavity 6 (see FIG. 1). However, the present mold, as set forth in claim 10, requires that **a single first plate and a single second plate cooperatively form a cavity therebetween**. As such, Matsuda et al clearly do not disclose or suggest the present mold, as set forth in claim 10.

Further, Matsuda et al. discloses (e.g., FIG. 1) that the resin is injected into the cavity 6 via a sprue (not labeled) that is located in the template 1, which is separate from the cavity block 7. Thus, the cavity block 7 is provided to define, in large part, the cavity 6, while another part (i.e. the template 1), distinct therefrom, serves to define the sprue. Thus, Matsuda et al. fails to teach or suggest the second plate, as set forth in claim 10, as amended.

Therefore, it is submitted that Matsuda et al., whether taken alone or in combination with any one or more of the other cited references, does not teach or suggest the mold as set forth in claim 10.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that the amended claim 10 is novel, unobvious, and patentable under both 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103 over Matsuda et al and the other cited references. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claim 10 are respectfully requested.

Claim 11 depends directly on amended claim 10, which is asserted to be in condition for allowance under §102 and §103 as detailed above. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 11 is also novel, unobvious and patentable under both 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103 over Matsuda and the other cited references.

Appl. No. 10/749,045  
Amdt. Dated October 8, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2007

Claim 12 has been canceled, without prejudice, and, therefore, the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103***

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al.

In response to the rejection of claim 13, Applicant has canceled claim 13 without prejudice, rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claims 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al in view of Nishigaki.

Claims 14-19 depend directly or indirectly on amended claim 10, which is asserted to be in condition for allowance under §102 and §103 over Matsuda et al for the reasons as detailed above. Accordingly, claims 14-19 should also be patentable.

In response to the rejection of claim 20, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claim 20 is unpatentable over Matsuda et al in view of Nishigaki, and thus should be allowed.

Claim 20, as amended, recites in part:

**“providing a mold including opposite first and second plates wherein the first plate defines a non-oblique side wall, said second plate defines an oblique side wall spatially facing to the non-oblique side wall, the first plate and the second plate commonly define a cavity therebetween for forming said light guide plate, the first plate has a sprue defined therein, and the sprue communicates with the cavity.”** (emphasis added)

Appl. No. 10/749,045  
Amdt. Dated October 8, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2007

First of all, in the mold of Matsuda et al (see FIG. 1), the sprue (not labeled) is positioned in the template 1. Secondly, the portion of the template 1 facing the cavity 6 is generally non-oblique (i.e., parallel) to the opposed facing portion of the template 2. Instead, it is the cavity block 7, which is adjacent to the template 1, and the facing cavity block 3 that together define one oblique side wall and one spatially-facing non-oblique side wall. However, the present mold, as set forth in claim 20, requires that the sprue is positioned in the first plate, which forms a non-oblique side spatially facing an oblique side of the second plate. As such, Matsuda et al clearly does not disclose or suggest the present method, as set forth in claim 20.

Thirdly, though Nishigaki discloses or suggests a method for producing light guide plate, Nishigaki fails to disclose that a cavity is formed by an oblique side wall and a non-oblique side wall. That is, Nishigaki fails to overcome the stated shortcomings of Matsuda et al., with respect to the present method, as set forth in claim 20.

Accordingly, claim 20 should be patentable over Matsuda et al in view of Nishigaki, taken alone or in combination with any of the other cited references.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuda et al in view of Nishigaki and Choi.

As set forth in the arguments with respect to claim 10, Matsuda et al clearly fails to teach or suggest the method as recited in claim 1. Nishigaki discloses a method for producing a light guide plate, and Choi et al discloses or suggests an injection rate of 1-10,000 cm<sup>2</sup>/sec. However, claim 1 still should be patentable over Matsuda et al in view of Nishigaki and Choi et al.,

Appl. No. 10/749,045  
Amdt. Dated October 8, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of July 9, 2007

since both of Nishigaki and Choi et al. are unable to overcome the shortcomings of Matsuda with respect to claim 1. Claim 1, along with claims 2-9 depending therefrom, accordingly should be allowable.

#### New Claims

Newly added claim 21 depend upon claim 20, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and thus is also allowable. Further, Applicant submits that the subject matter of claim 21, when considered in conjunction with the limitations on the first plate in claim 20, is patentable on its own merits.

#### Conclusion

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ga-Lane Chen et al

By

  
Jeffrey T. Knapp

Registration No.: 45,384

Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

1650 Memorex Drive

Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (714) 626-1229